



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

For example, in 1, 14*b*, "therefore, proclaim not that my son is a king," is better than "my son to be king;" in 1, 20*b*, read "another one that hath been born is king," not "the king is that other one who was born." Again, it might have been well for the translator to indicate, for the benefit of those who cannot read the Syriac original, that the introduction to the song on the birth of our Lord is a play on the word ܠܒܝܐ, the Syriac translation of ἀνατολή in Luke 1:78. This is not brought out at all in the German version, where we have three different words for the six times recurrent verb; and there is nothing to show that two nouns from the same root occur and that one pun is made on it. In general, however, the work is well done and is to be commended.

R. D. WILSON.

WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Allegheny, Pa.

BEER'S TEXT OF JOB.¹

The conscientious teacher of Old Testament exegesis who is not satisfied with the mere reproduction of half a dozen commentaries finds himself, on every step, embarrassed by the condition of the text which he undertakes to explain. He may be hampered, much to his chagrin, by lack of time and means; his interests may be historical or theological; yet, who would wholly dispense with the tedious labor of textual criticism, causing fatigue of the body and anguish of soul? We often pray to be spared at least the bending over so many books which no device, it appears, can put within a convenient distance from our desk. We need, especially for the more difficult books, a collection of textual data gathered mainly from the versions, but also from old and modern commentaries which frequently contain valuable hints and occasionally offer conjectural emendations possessing a high degree of probability. While the textual critic cannot very well accomplish his task without constant recourse to the probable meaning of the context, he is, on the whole, proof against the temptations which beset the path of the exegete who would, at all hazards, elicit some sense from a stubborn and enigmatical text; the textual critic is indeed in a position to weigh the textual evidence coolly, without prejudice or preconceived opinion. We do not care so much for results—it is our own business to give them definite form—as for the material out of which the text is to be created. Such a collection of material is not necessarily a mechanical piece of work. An uncritical array of readings will be of very little use to us. We want evidence sifted. That which is unessential for our purposes need not be given a place. Above all, the text underlying the versions must be restored; it is on this slippery ground where the utmost caution is required. Paraphrastic expansion is carefully to be distinguished from a rendering which is literal. A thorough acquaintance with the

¹ DER TEXT DES BUCHES HIOB. Untersucht von Lic. Dr. Georg Beer. Zwei Hefte. Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Buchhandlung, 1895, 1897. ix + xvi + 258 pp. (p. 89 is printed twice). M. 2.80 + 5.60.

translator's methods and exegetical skill is necessary for the correct estimation of what constitutes a variant. No honest work of this kind need fear the opprobrious slur that it is but "Kleinarbeit." Dr. Beer's unostentatious collection of textual data for the book of Job puts every Bible student under lasting obligations. His method is thoroughly scientific; his apparatus is almost complete (*cf.* the works enumerated in the introduction); nothing is too trifling to escape his attention; with him as a guide, we find ourselves, at a glance, in the possession of all the material obtainable. We may differ, perhaps, as to the results; much may be found on closer examination to be untenable, and it is but natural that continued attention to *minutiae* dulls the faculty of intuitive perception ("Divinationsgabe"). Thus, the author is not quite felicitous in his own emendations, which at times betray a superficial familiarity with the genius of the Hebrew language; he often burdens the conscience of the Greek translator (LXX.) with impossible combinations of Hebrew words. It was the privilege of the writer of this review to use the first half last year, while revising, for class instruction, his own notes on the book of Job. His testimony is that, while the book does not altogether do away with the necessity of consulting the versions (especially on lexical and purely exegetical points), Dr. Beer's little book is a great time-saver. The following remarks, copied from the writer's notes, show a few of the author's shortcomings; their small number indeed testifies to the excellence of the work.

P. 18, ad 10a (I write *a* and *b* for the author's 1 and 2), last line: 27:5 for 17:5. LXX., of course, read **יִסָּר**.

P. 20, ad 17a: **רַעֲשִׁים** is impossible. Is **רָשִׁים** to be read?

P. 22: **דָּבַר אֱלֹהִים** (הַשְׁגָּה?)—is no Hebrew. LXX. presents but a free rendering of MT.

Ibid.: **ἰσχυρὸν δὲ ῥημάτων σου** = **יָצַח מִלִּיָּדָה**.

P. 24, ad 10a: **γαυρίαμα δέ** = **וְרִנִּי**.

P. 28, ad 20a: **παρὰ τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι αὐτοὺς ἑαυτοῖς βοηθῆσαι** = **מִבְּלִי מוֹשִׁיעַ לְנִצָּחַ** is left untranslated.

P. 35, ad 2a: LXX. read **שְׂקוֹל יִשְׁקֹל** (not **שׁוֹקֵל**).

P. 36, ad 4a: **κεντοῦσί με** = **יִדְקְרוּנִי**. **Κεντέω** is a *ἀπ. λεγ.*: **κέντημα** is used by Sym., Th. for the Hebrew **מִדְקְרוֹת** Prov. 12:18.

P. 39, ad 14a: **ἀπέπατο** goes back to **מָאס** (not to **מוֹשׁ** which Zech. 3:9 is mistranslated, while Mic. 2:3 the verb *αἶρω* is used); with the same verb (again in the middle) **מָאס** is translated 10:3; 19:18. **Ἀπειπεῖν** means *renounce, give up*: "thou renoucest the work of thy hands" **תִּמָּאס יָנִיעַ** "have renounced me" are good renderings of **עִיִּלִּים** and **כַּפֵּיךְ** and **עִיִּלִּים מָאָסוּ בִּי**. "He denied me kindness" may well be said; of course, **מָאָס חֶסֶד מִפֶּי** is no Hebrew construction. The present passage, therefore, is mistranslated; but the reading presupposed by LXX. is **מָאָס (ל)**, which some Hebrew codd. indeed have, while others at least have it in the text (*kērib*) with the reading of our prints on the margin (*kērē*).

P. 43, ad 29b: "Für ער las G eine Verbalform." The Greek verb undoubtedly corresponds to the Hebrew ער; cf. Prov. 23:35, $\mu\epsilon\theta' \omega\nu \sigmaυνελύσσομαι$ for MT. ער, in which the translator saw a derivative of יער; cf. Josh. 11:5, where the verb is used for MT. יויער. Observe that LXX. omits בה. $N\dot{u}n \alpha\rho\epsilon\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota = \text{ויעתה הואילו}$, v. 28.

Ibid., ad 30b: יהגה לא הבין יהגה is no Hebrew. LXX. seems to have read: $\alpha\mu \chi\alpha\iota \lambda\alpha \text{ יהגה תבונות}$; cf. Ps. 49:4.

P. 51, ad 12a: באב LXX. $\epsilon\pi\iota \rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\eta\varsigma$ on its stem. Cf. in the Talmud באביה (מחבר) opp. חלוש (Levy, I., 3: 'Arūx, ed. Kohut, I., 2).

P. 52, ad 17b: $\sigmaυμπαλαχ\acute{\eta}\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ goes back to יאחזק (cf. Beer a little below).

P. 57, ad 12a: $\Sigma \alpha\nu\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\iota$. Cf. $\alpha\rho\acute{\rho}\alpha\sigma\epsilon\iota$ LXX. Ps. 10:9, 10 = ירחט.

P. 58, ad 18b: שבע is, as a rule, construed with the accusative. Hence also is Wellhausen's emendation of Ps. 73:10 hardly an improvement upon that of Lagarde.

P. 60, ad 26a: Possibly LXX. read נתיבה.

P. 63, ad 8a: $\mu\epsilon\tau\grave{\alpha} \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\beta\alpha\lambda\acute{\omega}\nu$ is not ואחר שבת, but simply ותשב; cf. 16:6 (Josh. 8:21), where $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\nu$ is added pleonastically.

P. 68, ad 4a: מלאכתי is, of course, out of the question.

P. 68, ad 6a: The late Hebrew עלם *be strong* is not to the point; תעלמות is translated $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$ in the sense of "hidden forces"; cf. 28:11.

Ibid., ad 7b: Does $\alpha\phi\acute{\iota}\kappa\omicron\nu$ point to תמטא (תמטרה)? מטא is Ethiopic መጠጠ.

P. 71, ad 2b: "Doch vgl. auch Ruth 3:12." But LXX. omits there the second כי.

Ibid., ad 4: ר' (sic!).

P. 72, ad 5: To Beer's reading objection may be made on the ground that רגל is as a rule fem. in Hebrew. It is furthermore unlikely that, with עתות in the first hemistich, מועד in the second should not mean "appointed season."

P. 73, ad 6a: שדרי אלהים is no Hebrew.

P. 78, ad 4a: The Talmudic אול *initium, principium* will best be left alone.

P. 79, ad 12a: A glance at $\alpha\pi\omicron\beta\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ in the new Concordance shows, in the first place, that the verb occurs quite frequently in our book, and, secondly, that no Hebrew equivalent is to be looked for. LXX. read רניכם ימשל לאפר. "Will be likened to ashes," so Moses Kimhī; cf. Targum (מתיל לקטמא), Vulg. (comparabitur cineri). In b the ל has then its usual force, ממשל to be supplied from a (so Rashi). The septuagintal רניכם seems to be correct. The solid dialectic tower of Job's friends will crumble like dust. I admit that the text is illegible, but I believe that I know the sense.

P. 84, ad 4sq.: LXX. read לא אחד (or אמ) מו יתן טהור מטמא ארץ. $\mu\omicron \text{ יתן טהור מטמא ארץ}$ corresponds to MT. חר(ר) צימי(י) חר(ר) צ. Observe חר(ר) צימי(י) חר(ר) צ. The text read by LXX.

makes in itself good sense and good Hebrew: man, born of filth (טמא in the neuter sense, the טפה טרוהה), cannot be pure if he but lived one day. But this thought is out of place in the present context, where man's insignificance and ephemeral existence are in the foreground. But the same objection holds good of the reading of MT.

P. 85, ad 11a: LXX. presents a free rendering which must not be retranslated literally.

P. 87, ad 16b: The septuagintal rendering, to my mind, presupposes MT. without the negative. לא is obliterated by ibn Ezra (by inserting—on the principle of elliptic constructions borrowed from ibn ʿĠanah; it is virtually a textual emendation—after the verb the restrictive (רק): thou constantly watchest my sin, none of my sins escapes thee.

P. 98, ad 32a: LXX. may have also read זְמִירָתוֹ (Num. 13:23); cf. *τομῆ* = זְמִיר Cant. 2:12.

P. 104, ad 15b: Pešit. (Targ.) seems indeed to have read: וְגוֹלְלָתִי; cf. Isa. 9:4, where Pešit. has the same verb as here: מַעֲלָה.

MAX L. MARGOLIS.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA.

BARNES' APPARATUS CRITICUS TO CHRONICLES.¹

This little book is rightly dedicated to that illustrious fellow of Peterhouse, Brian Walton. It is a valuable addition to the *apparatus criticus* to the Peshitta prepared by Herbert Thorndike and found in Vol. VI. of the London polyglot. Thorndike compared for Chronicles the text of Pococke 391 and Bodleian 141 with the text of Walton; all three texts being poor and late. Dr. Barnes has collated the four great editions of the Peshitta—to wit, those of the Paris and London polyglots, Lee's, and the Ooroomiah. He has, also, collated the Ambrosian and one other codex of the sixth century, the Florentine codex of the ninth century, and the Buchanan Bible of the twelfth; besides, eight MSS. of the seventeenth century, one of them, Sachau 90, being a Nestorian manuscript of great and often decisive value, and five MSS. of uncertain date; in all, four texts and seventeen MSS. The collation of so many MSS. must have involved a great deal of work. The reviewer has had time and means to look over the citations of *U* (Ooroomiah) alone. He found that the author has not noted a different numeration of verses, which often occurs, and sometimes a slightly different spelling is passed unnoticed. Besides, he has cited incorrectly the following: In 1 Chron. 16:1 *U* reads מַעֲלָה, not מַעֲלָה. In 2 Chron. 33:3 *U* omits עָ. In 2 Chron. 29:23 *U* has the correct spelling לַעֲזָרָה. The author does not always indicate when his authorities have made omissions. For example, *U*

¹ AN APPARATUS CRITICUS TO CHRONICLES IN THE PESHITTA VERSION. With a Discussion of the Value of the Codex Ambrosianus. By W. E. Barnes, D.D., Fellow of Peterhouse, formerly Lecturer at Clare College. Cambridge: At the University Press; London: C. J. Clay and Sons; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1897. Cloth. xxxiv+63 pp.; 8vo.